

and judicial philosophy be judged on the basis of a few statements, arguably very ambiguous statements. I cannot ignore the overall theme of the speeches from which these statements were taken. The speeches in no way advocated activism. They only advocated change in the legal profession.

Ms. Morrow's legal career speaks for itself. She will be an asset to the Federal bench, in my opinion. Thus, when Ms. Morrow's statements are read in context, they do not paint a picture of a potential activist. Moreover, when asked by the members of the committee to explain her judicial philosophy and her approach to judging, she gave an answer with which any strict constructionist would agree. And when asked to explain whether her speeches were intended to suggest that judges should be litigating from the bench, she adamantly denied such a claim.

Given her plausible explanation of these statements criticized by my good friends from the Judiciary Committee and her sworn testimony that she would uphold the Constitution and abide by the rule of law, I have to give her the benefit of the doubt and will vote to confirm her. I think and I hope my colleagues will do the same.

Ordinarily, I believe that a nominee's testimony should be credited unless there is overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Here, those who oppose this nominee lack such evidence. What they are left with are snippets from some of her speeches, speeches that we are trying to divine the intent of, while lacking the evidence to think otherwise.

I will credit the testimony of the nominee and her stated commitment to the rule of law. I sincerely hope that she will not disappoint me, and I believe that she is a person of integrity and one who will judge, as she has promised, in accordance with the highest standards of the judgeship profession and with the highest standards of the Constitution and the rule of law.

On this basis, I support the nominee. I believe we all should support this nominee. She has had a thorough hearing and we have had many, many discussions of this. But I just don't think we should take things out of context and stop a nominee on that basis.

With that, I hope our colleagues will support the nominee. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Margaret M. Morrow, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California?

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. BREAUX. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is absent attending a funeral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced, yeas 67, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 11 Ex.]

YEAS—67

Abraham	Faircloth	Lott
Akaka	Feingold	Lugar
Baucus	Feinstein	Mack
Bennett	Frist	McCain
Biden	Glenn	Mikulski
Bingaman	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Graham	Moynihan
Breaux	Gregg	Murray
Bryan	Harkin	Reed
Bumpers	Hatch	Robb
Byrd	Hollings	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hutchison	Roth
Chafee	Inouye	Santorum
Cleland	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kennedy	Snowe
Conrad	Kerrey	Stevens
Daschle	Kerry	Thompson
DeWine	Kohl	Torricelli
Dodd	Landrieu	Wellstone
Domenici	Lautenberg	Wyden
Dorgan	Leahy	
Durbin	Lieberman	

NAYS—28

Allard	Gramm	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Roberts
Brownback	Hagel	Sessions
Burns	Helms	Shelby
Coats	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Coverdell	Inhofe	Thomas
Craig	Kempthorne	Thurmond
D'Amato	Kyl	
Enzi	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—5

Ford	Reid	Warner
Levin	Specter	

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay it on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE 299TH ANNIVERSARY OF FRENCH COLONIZATION

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I rise today to recognize an important day in the history of this nation—a day that may intrigue some of you who are not familiar with Southern history. To-

morrow is the 299th anniversary of the landing of D'Iberville on the shores of present-day Mississippi, and the beginning of the French colonization of the American South.

Madam President, my colleagues are familiar with the English landings in Jamestown and Plymouth, Maryland and Pennsylvania. Some may recall the Spanish settlements up the eastern seaboard or the missions in the far West. But I suspect few of you know of the French colonization of the deep South and the frontier of the future United States, and the deeds of men like Pierre Lemoyne Sieur D'Iberville, the French military officer who began that colonization.

However, down home, all along the Mississippi Gulf Coast, we know and we remember. We remember how D'Iberville's band of French soldiers, hunters, farmers and adventurers began the exploration and occupation of the lower Mississippi valley. We remember that this landing eventually gave birth to towns as far-flung as Biloxi, Natchez, Mobile, New Orleans, Baton Rouge, Memphis, St. Joseph, Detroit, and Galveston.

My native Mississippi Gulf Coast is a place of year-round beauty, romance, and charm. It is easy to understand why the French chose to found their first colony there.

We are throwing a party today, in Biloxi, Mississippi, where D'Iberville landed, 299 years ago tomorrow, and in Ocean Springs, where he built Fort Maurepas. As I am sure you have heard, we know how to throw a party. But next year, on this very day, will be the 300th anniversary of D'Iberville's landing. And I especially want to invite every one of my colleagues and you, Madam President, to attend that celebration.

All along the Mississippi Gulf Coast, from my native Pascagoula west to Pass Christian and Bay St. Louis, hundreds of volunteers are already planning and preparing a vast array of festivals, parties, national sporting events, educational activities, and cultural exchanges with French cities, working to make our 1699 Tricentennial a truly wonderful celebration.

In conjunction with next year's festivities will be the Mardi Gras Celebration in all the coast towns, from Texas to Florida. I believe all of my colleagues are familiar with Mardi Gras.

But the Tricentennial celebrations are more than just festivities. They are celebrations of how really diverse we are in the deep South, how wonderfully varied and multi-cultural our Southern heritage, our American heritage really is, and how much we've accomplished over the past 300 years!

Come to the Gulf Coast next year with us, and help us celebrate that diverse culture, and our hard-won economic prosperity. You might be surprised. You'll find that whether we are of French, Scottish, Irish, Spanish, Yugoslavian, Vietnamese, English, African-American or Native American

ancestry, or a little of everything, we are all fair, honest, hardworking, and friendly to a fault. And we can all cook!! And we all talk with this accent!!

So come down and join us, if not this year, certainly for the big Tricentennial celebration. A lot of faces and names will be familiar to you: Brett Favre, the great NFL quarterback, astronauts Fred Haise of Apollo XIII and Stuart Roosa, and the works of great American painter Walter Anderson and potter George E. Ohr. And the places to see!—the beautiful home of Jefferson Davis, the beaches, the southern way of life, the unique nightlife, the Mardi Gras, the 1699 celebrations and re-enactments.

Madam President, I invite all my colleagues to come down to the Gulf Coast next year and join us in the wonderful celebration of our Tricentennial.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, February 10, 1998, the Federal debt stood at \$5,471,889,906,215.21 (Five trillion, four hundred seventy-one billion, eight hundred eighty-nine million, nine hundred six thousand, two hundred fifteen dollars and twenty-one cents).

One year ago, February 10, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,302,292,000,000 (Five trillion, three hundred two billion, two hundred ninety-two million).

Five years ago, February 10, 1993, the Federal debt stood at \$4,172,770,000,000 (Four trillion, one hundred seventy-two billion, seven hundred seventy million).

Ten years ago, February 10, 1988, the Federal debt stood at \$2,452,575,000,000 (Two trillion, four hundred fifty-two billion, five hundred seventy-five million).

Fifteen years ago, February 10, 1983, the Federal debt stood at \$1,194,868,000,000 (One trillion, one hundred ninety-four billion, eight hundred sixty-eight million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,277,021,906,215.21 (Four trillion, two hundred seventy-seven billion, twenty-one million, nine hundred six thousand, two hundred fifteen dollars and twenty-one cents) during the past 15 years.

HUMAN CLONING PROHIBITION ACT OF 1998

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Madam President, I would like to take a moment to commend my colleagues for voting "no" this morning on the effort to shut down debate and take up S. 1601, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 1998 without hearings or the benefit of a comprehensive Committee review of the bill.

At the outset, I want to make it clear that I stand with the vast majority of Americans who oppose efforts to clone human beings. S. 1601, however, does much more than that. The bill includes a permanent ban on the act of

human somatic cell nuclear transfer, which means taking the nucleus—which contains DNA—from a mature cell and putting it into an egg cell from which the original nucleus has been removed. Although the bill defines the product of such a transfer as an embryo, it is not actually a fertilized egg, as that term is commonly understood. It is an unfertilized egg cell that contains DNA from another source. It is true that if this cell were implanted in a woman's womb, it could very well develop into a baby. However, the cell may also be grown in a laboratory to become skin, nerve, or muscle tissue.

Because of its ban on human somatic cell transfer, there is a strong likelihood that S. 1601 would extinguish biomedical research in several vital areas. Scientists are examining approaches to treating disease that won't depend on drugs, but on stem cells that can differentiate into brain, skin, blood, or heart cells. S. 1601 would put an end to such research whenever somatic cell nuclear transfer is involved. Thus, it would outlaw efforts to create cardiac muscle cells to treat heart attack victims and degenerative heart disease; skin cells to treat burn victims; spinal cord neuron cells for the treatment of spinal cord trauma and paralysis; neural cells to treat those suffering from Parkinson's disease, Huntington's disease, and Lou Gehrig's disease; blood cells to treat cancer anemia and immunodeficiencies; cells for use in genetic therapy to treat 5,000 genetic diseases, including cystic fibrosis, Tay-Sachs, schizophrenia, and depression; liver cells for the treatment of such diseases as hepatitis and cirrhosis; and myriad other cells for use in the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of a multitude of serious and life-threatening medical conditions.

Consider the effect that S. 1601 would have on research related to the treatment of diabetes. A diabetes patient has a shortage of insulin-producing cells in her pancreas. Somatic cell nuclear transfer technology may allow for the transplantation of a large number of insulin-producing cells into the diabetic patient that would be genetically identical to her. As a result, rejection would not be an issue and the patient would be cured. S. 1601 would stifle research into this promising approach to the treatment of diabetes.

Moreover, S. 1601 would prevent doctors from utilizing certain treatments that already exist, such as an effective therapy for mitochondrial disease, which causes infertility in women.

In sum, too much is at stake to allow legitimate concerns over human cloning to quash the beneficial research and existing treatments associated with somatic cell nuclear transfer. Over 120 medical research, industry, and patient advocacy organizations have expressed the view that S. 1601 would do just that. That is why I am co-sponsor of Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator KENNEDY's substitute bill, S. 1602. This legislation, drafted with the

assistance of the National Bioethics Advisory Commission (NBAC), the National Institutes of Health, the American Society for Reproductive Medicine, the Biotech Industry Association, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Food and Drug Administration, imposes a 10-year ban on the implantation of the product of somatic cell nuclear transfer into a woman's uterus. While it bans the cloning of human beings for 10 years, the bill does not prohibit the cloning of molecules, DNA, cells, tissues, or non-human animals. It therefore does not restrict important biomedical and agricultural research that will improve the quality of life for millions of Americans and save the lives of many more.

S. 1602 requires that in four-and-a-half years the NBAC prepare and submit a report on the state of the science of cloning; the ethical and social issues related to the potential use of this technology in human beings; and the wisdom of extending the prohibition. The bill also requires the President to seek cooperation with other countries to establish international restrictions similar to those it enumerates.

Madam President, S. 1601 was brought directly to the floor two days after it was introduced without a day of committee hearings or a markup. The Senate did the right thing today when it decided that such a far-reaching bill with so many implications for the future direction of scientific inquiry must be carefully considered in committee. I am confident that we will ultimately agree upon a bipartisan approach to dealing with the issues raised by cloning technology, one that ensures that life-saving medical research will not be threatened. Through its action today, the Senate has sent the message that it intends to give this complex matter the thoughtful and deliberative consideration it deserves.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the resolution of the Senate of January 24, 1901, on Monday, February 23, 1998, immediately following the prayer and the disposition of the Journal, the traditional reading of the Washington's Farewell Address take place and that the Chair be authorized to appoint a Senator to perform this task.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.